

CALIFORNIA CHILDREN & FAMILIES COMMISSION

**Thursday, October 19, 2000
Veteran's Home of California
at Yountville
Grant Hall
1000 California Avenue
Yountville, CA 94599**

I. Call to Order.

Commissioner Susan Lacey called the meeting to order at 9:45 a.m.

II. Roll Call.

Present were Commissioners Kim Belshe, Sandra Gutierrez, Susan Lacey, Louis Vismara, Ed Melia and Margaret Fortune and Chairman Reiner.

Staff Present: Jane I. Henderson, Ph.D., Executive Director; Joe Munso, Chief Deputy Director; Emily Nahat, Deputy Director for Program Management.

III. Welcome.

Commissioner Lacey introduced Katheryn Winter of the Napa County Children and Families Commission (NCCFC). Ms. Winter welcomed everyone to Napa and expressed her pride regarding the use of Grant Hall as this month's Commission meeting place, as it was in Grant Hall that a recent 3-day *visioning process* resulted in the awarding of NCCFC's first grants.

IV. Approval of Minutes, September 21, 2000 State Commission Meeting.

MOTION: Commissioner Gutierrez moved, seconded by Commissioner Vismara to approve the September 21, 2000 minutes. The motion passed unanimously.

V. Chairman's Report

Chair Reiner reported that the Commission has received additional strategic plans from Calaveras, Sacramento and Sutter, which brings the number of strategic plans to 45 with only 13 remaining. Chairman Reiner provided an update on SAFE from the Start conferences. A statewide conference was held and regional forums will be held this winter to give local policy makers, administrators, advocates, educators and others all access to information and strategies about how to protect young children from exposure to violence. Chairman Reiner briefly talked about the ramifications of early childhood exposure to violence and stated that these forums will inform the participants of resources available to deal with these issues. He further recommended the viewing of an educational video by Dr. Bruce Perry regarding early childhood exposure to violence. Two forums have been held so far, the first was held on September 19th in Fresno and the second was in Redding on October 16th. The Fresno forum represented several surrounding counties and had good media coverage. The keynote speaker was Robyn Carr Morris, her address was entitled *Ghosts from the Nursery - Tracing the Roots of Violence*. The keynote speaker for the Redding conference, which also represented several surrounding counties, was Linda Chamberlain, Director of the Alaska Family Prevention Project, her address was entitled *The Impact of Violence on the Developing*

Child. All forums will be held by the end of this year. Scheduling and locations can be found at www.safefromthestart.org.

Chair Reiner reported that there would be a legislative hearing on domestic violence at which the State Commission will address the impact of domestic violence on children. Commissioner Sandra Gutierrez along with Attorney General Bill Lockyer and several other experts in the field will present this. The purpose of this hearing is to educate policy makers on the effects of children's exposure to violence and to develop ideas and legislation for new and improved strategies for intervening with children exposed to violence. Chair Reiner stated that he viewed this invitation to speak as a clear indication of the increasing importance of this Commission in the role of developing policy. He thanked Commissioner Gutierrez for representing the Commission at this hearing.

Chair Reiner reported on a meeting with Roy Romer, Superintendent of the Los Angeles Unified School District, in Los Angeles two weeks ago to discuss ways to proactively use schools in partnerships with the Commission in addressing child development and school readiness.

Chair Reiner discussed the possibility of a change in process for commission meetings. The Commission found that many of the agenda items needed further discussion before being put to a vote. Chair Reiner recommended that items be on the agenda at least one month in advance.

Chair Reiner called for a *broad vision* on what the Commission wants to do with respect to using available funds. He reported on meetings with Governor Davis and others to discuss the development of an initiative for school readiness. It is expected that by January the Commission will have a better indication of the recommendations that the administration will have with regard to the school readiness initiative.

VI. Discussion on the State Commission Spending Plan.

Joe Munso, Chief Deputy of CCFC presented the Draft Spending Plan. The final spending plan will be presented in November. The Draft contains items that have been approved or that may be considered for approval. The document will be periodically updated as new items come up for consideration. Mr. Munso outlined some of the points to be discussed in November with respect to budgeting. The document was being presented for feedback from the Commission.

Commissioner Vismara inquired into the whereabouts of specific funds in the Draft for the Diversity Committee and for the hiring of consultants. Mr. Munso replied that those funds are in the Administration account.

Commissioner Belshe asked for clarification on this document being an informational outline. She suggested that the idea of increasing funds for existing programs be considered as well as funds for new programs. Mr. Munso responded in the affirmative.

Public Comments

Gene Lucas, general public member, raised questions to the Commission regarding items on the spending plan. Mr. Lucas expressed confusion over funding for RFP. Mr. Lucas suggested the addition of an item for evaluation of Mass Media. Mr. Lucas pointed out that there is no item under Research and Development called Research and suggested that one be added. He also suggested making *well baby kits* available now.

Barbara Rosen from the March of Dimes emphasized prenatal care.

Dr. Henderson clarified that this document reflects the objectives and priorities that the State has adopted to date, and identifies where the resources are and where they may best be used in new items.

Commissioner Belshe noted that it would be helpful to have a more detailed update on previous expenditures. Dr. Henderson replied that the update is being planned and added that some items that were initially approved for one year, should be considered for funding for additional years.

Commissioner Fortune asked if the document reflected total unexpended funds by fiscal year. Mr. Munso replied that it did not because funds could not be moved around, but that the next chart will include the total.

Commissioner Vismara asked for clarification on, and expressed the importance of, how research within the media component will be handled, specifically the efficacy of the research. Mr. Munso replied that there are evaluations within the contracts themselves and suggested that additional evaluations could be added in terms of long-term perspectives. Commissioner Vismara proposed an independent evaluation. Dr. Henderson pointed out that the current RFP does not contain independent assessment of the work done. Mr. Munso acknowledged the need for a specific project to look at the Commission's media campaign.

Commission Belshe suggested partnering with other agencies to carry out some of the items that the Commission may enter into rather than tasking staff with these items.

VII. Master Plan for Early Care and Education.

Executive Director Jane Henderson presented a follow-up report to a discussion that the Commission had at the last meeting regarding the invitation received from the Chair of the Joint Committee for Kindergarten through University Master Plan. Dr. Henderson and Chair Reiner met with Senator Alpert to address uncertainty in the scope and direction of the *early education and school readiness* component of the Master Plan. Dr. Henderson noted that the most important clarification made was that the Commission is being asked to develop a school readiness component of a public education master plan. The question of how to proceed with the development of this component without precluding advancement of the master plan still remains. Staff met with the Child Care Law Center and with the Governor's Health Care and Development Advisory Committee to discuss the aforementioned issues. The Joint Committee would expect the Commission to staff and pay for the Commission's workgroup. Other workgroups have obtained outside funding and it is possible that funding from the Legislature will be available for the Commission's workgroup. Dr. Henderson discussed the notion of an additional workgroup to address the school readiness component of the master plan. The workgroup would be comprised of members from several disciplines, including members from existing committees, as well as, experts in early childhood development, early childhood educators and fiscal experts in order to facilitate an integrated approach to the workgroups' tasks.

Senator Alpert stressed, during this meeting, the focus on children in poverty, non-English speakers and children with disabilities, recognizing that it is typically these children that are on the lower end of the readiness scale. Also discussed during the meeting was the preliminary scope of work for the Commission's involvement which may include: identification of the kinds of early education experiences that best prepare children for kindergarten; an examination of the service delivery system in places where children would have access to those kinds of experiences, including families and home settings, community settings, school settings; looking at new models and alternative modes of service delivery; looking at funding sources including, business linkages and linkages with the private sector in general; definitions of standards for school readiness. The Committee is interested in having the Commission involved in doing needed research, working in a leadership role, providing funding and contracting out for some of the services that

would be needed to complete the work. Each of the workgroups will have an unpaid chair that will have knowledge, expertise and some political experience. Dr. Henderson described the composition of the workgroup and possible modes of appointment to the workgroup.

Senator Alpert informed Dr. Henderson that the Governor has not yet taken a position on the work of this workgroup and that the Speaker of the Assembly is quite interested.

Dr. Henderson recommended further discussion on the workgroup and described some of the points to be discussed. These points included: what the scope and areas of work would be; development of a work plan and budget to be submitted to the Commission for approval at the November meeting. Dr. Henderson indicated that the Commission's scope of work would be completed by mid December and that the full master plan must be completed by August 2002.

A general discussion relating to Dr. Henderson's report followed. Some of the topics discussed included: funding of the workgroup, definition of readiness; child development in non-traditional educational environments; demystification of terms relating to school readiness; state and county collaboration; timeline constraints; and resource allocation implications for staff.

Public Comment

Nancy Stroll from the Child Care Law Center in San Francisco agreed with the Commission on the need for collaboration in developing the master plan. Ms. Stroll informed the Commission that Senator Escutia is interested in looking at the master plan. A second legislative initiative explains the process that has gone on in the field, which includes the United Child Care campaign, PAC and many Proposition 10 Commission members. The Child Care Law Center in San Francisco is in the process of finalizing input gathered from 100 people during 3 meetings regarding a framework that organizations have an opportunity to endorse. Ms. Stroll encouraged the Commission to include an element that hears not only from the experts but also from people throughout the state and that this be integrated with the whole process so there are not two parallel processes occurring between the Commission and the Legislature. Ms. Stroll expressed her appreciation for the efforts of the Commission on these matters.

Commissioner Belshe asked Ms. Stroll to speak to the concerns that were raised in the context of the Escutia bill that resulted in the bill not moving forward this past session. Ms. Stroll expressed her personal opinion that the bill was not ready to be passed due to the need for more discussion and that there was not time to finalize agreement on that particular bill.

Lisa Lee of the Parent Services Project and Chair of the Solano Commission reported that results from a survey of over 2700 parents indicated that school readiness is a principal concern.

Kay Ryan, Executive Director of the Child Development Policy Advisory Committee (CDPAC), thanked the Commission for its efforts in defining what it is that is being discussed. CDPAC has been working to develop a common language around what a master plan means. CDPAC has realized, after listening to the Commission, that their efforts have been duplicative. CDPAC offered its support to the Commission in its efforts. Commissioner Vismara expressed concerns on the importance of involving the Governor's office and inquired how and at what point CDPAC would be doing so. Ms. Ryan responded that it was not of great concern because the document would have a life of its own.

Patricia Jennings, a local Commissioner and the Executive Director of the Montessori Family Center at Saint Helena, expressed her concerns about what she feels is a schism between child care and early childhood education that needs to be addressed.

Commissioner Fortune addressed Commissioner Vismara's concerns with respect to the involvement of the Governor's office. Commissioner Fortune noted that the Governor would be involved through normal legislative processes. With respect to the master plan, in the last budget cycle the Commission funded a policy review for child care that the Governor is still awaiting the results of. The Proposition 10 Commission has been involved with this in at least observing the process.

Commissioner Belshe expressed hope that the Commission would not need, as a prerequisite for involvement, the endorsement of the Governor.

Arlyce Currie with BANANAS, a resource and referral agency in Oakland, cautioned the Commission not to forget the babies, which are often overlooked.

Donita Stromgren, Public Policy Manager for the California Child Care Resource and Referral Network, expressed the need to include all-day preschool children in the focus of school readiness.

Commissioner Melia responded in general to all public comments made today by noting that the Commission has addressed all of these issues to some degree already and will continue to address the comments expressed by the members of the public.

VIII. Child Care Provider Compensation Matching Funds.

Ms. Emily Nahat introduced Ms. Sarah Neville, staff, who is the lead person on this project. Ms. Neville presented the concept paper, as follows:

1. Consistent with State Commission 2000-2001 Objectives and Priorities to provide matching funds to County Commissions for compensation of Child Care and Development Providers.
2. Action looking for: approval to develop and release an RFA, with more input, based on this paper.
3. From conversations with County Commissions, reading of strategic plans, and issues facing quality child care especially retention of qualified staff and child care compensation.
4. Only 1 in 7 child development centers is found to provide a level of quality that promotes healthy development and learning.
5. High staff turnover is one major component of child care that has a detrimental effect on quality of programs and on young children during a critical stage of development.
6. 70% of child care staff earns poverty level wages with providers in California having an average annual earning in '98 of \$14,940.
7. Turnover rate of 30-40% a year: Sites that pay better wages experience double the retention rate of other sites.
8. In creating paper:
 - Had many people participate through discussions, conference calls, meetings, reviewing Concept Paper: Co. Com., member of Diversity Committee, staff from State Agencies, and experts from field. (Thanks)
 - Will do similar process for RFA and application/intent components.
9. Focusing on a project that will:
 - Address retention of child care workers.
 - Improve quality and stabilize child care workforce by rewarding professionals who have demonstrated a commitment to the field through levels of education, continued professional development, and years of experience.
 - Contain various Retention Incentives such as:
 - Compensation, Stipends, Health Insurance, Respite/substitute time, One-time bonuses.
 - Include collaboration with CDE and AB212 Guidelines and promotes local collaboration. AB212 provided \$15M General fund for compensation strategies for subsidized child care

- center providers.
 - Produce an evaluation report that summarized effects of various retention strategies in stabilizing a qualified workforce.
10. Nature of Request:
- 3 year matching funds program
 - Counties will submit a comprehensive application in year one, and in subsequent years continuation of funding will be based upon (1) submission of required progress and expenditure reports and (2) alignment with AB212 Guidelines.
11. In an effort to address common County needs and develop a funding plan, the proposal is to begin with an application/letter of intent process and have two rounds. Justification:
- Some ready now and others later.
 - Intent to apply, which will help to go back and know how much to ask for.
 - AB212: don't want to end up with different systems. Hoping both will be general enough to address a variety of strategies.
 - Know that AB212 is for subsidized center providers, there will be similar criteria but it will provide funds for licensed providers, including family child care.
 - Proposing state match of 25%.
12. Only Co. Com. eligible to apply.
- Need to address it in Strategic Plans.
 - Req. to align with AB212.
 - Want to leverage funds so Match Commission Prop. 10 with combined local money.
 - For this round, AB212 won't be available.
 - For next round, consideration for, when funds become available, the role of AB212 funds as match.
13. Main areas discussed in conference call:
- Want to align with CDE so each others funds can be leveraged.
 - Real interest in collaborating with CDE and coordinating with LPCs but concern of locals regarding timeline.
 - Interested in collaborating and will be creating a form or sign-off that goes to both LPC and county Prop. 10 to show coordination on plan.
 - Lots of debate on phone calls about linking it to training or just longevity.
14. Accountability and major deliverables:
- Periodic/Regular Progress Report that provides a summary of county's project.
 - Periodic Expenditure Report.
 - All do formal evaluation of project and results.
 - Required to do data collection and put on data base system.
 - Part of County's annual audit.
15. Recommending that Commissions participate in PACE evaluation and we'll come back in December to ask for further funding for that so that counties will not need to fund evaluation. Separate money from Matching funds--approximately 10% of it.
- PACE has already been contacted by several counties who are considering implementing a retention program and want to know if they can join in the evaluation.
 - Counties will need to fund collection of data for their database.
 - View this as important. Need program evaluation to assess different strategies so this concept has strong evaluation component.
16. Systems change: funds that Prop 10 puts behind this effort aren't enough to raise salaries for all workers across state.
17. This information would help inform State Commission policy direction and funding decisions for future workforce initiatives. Help in the formulation of policy agenda for future.

18. Potential funds will not meet all need so some guidelines will be created for use in helping to prioritize funding. Criteria for awarding matching funds will be determined, with input from others, in course of developing application process. Criteria will state which populations the match money can be applied to. Issues such as:
 - Providers serving under served, more ed. and units.
 - Licensed providers.
19. Will not address unlicensed caregivers in this initiative but are investigating other methods including PACE's training which focuses on new providers in areas with less formal care and under served populations.
 - Strategies for unlicensed: Have multi-pronged strategy for different populations. CCFC has another part for professional development and getting unlicensed caregivers into system.
 - Looking at retention of qualified staff.
20. Not asking to approve certain funds yet. Two step process.
21. RFA = 2 steps: 1) Intent for 1st step 2) 2nd step = Application for funds.
22. Will be back in December for approval of a funding level based on the intents to apply.

Chairman Reiner commended staff for their efforts in this area and opened this for discussion.

Commissioner Fortune thanked Ms. Neville for her presentation and asked her where the money would come from once Prop 10 money is gone. Ms. Nahat responded that there would be a rolling start up of \$5, \$10 and then \$15 million annualized contribution. Ms. Nahat expressed the need for a strong evaluation component on the retention strategies and the first three years (as a minimum) would help in assessing whether or not there is a need for a long-term commitment.

Commissioner Vismara posed the question of whether or not the evaluation component would also look at the quality of child care providers. Ms. Nahat responded in the affirmative and described some of the indicators to be used. Commissioner Vismara stressed the need to maximize the efficacy and to clearly define the project objectives up front. Ms. Nahat informed the Commission that staff will address more evaluation component issues in December.

Commissioner Melia inquired as to the competitiveness of the proposed starting salary. Ms. Nahat responded by saying that it would not be competitive, but it will vary county by county. Commissioner Reiner asked about the average salary of child care providers. Ms. Neville replied \$15K. A brief discussion determined that the highest possible compensation would be in the neighborhood of \$21K. Dr. Henderson added that the CARES cost would be \$180 million, but is viewed as a pilot project.

Commissioner Gutierrez asked if any of the counties was currently looking at health care benefits instead of cash. Ms. Nahat responded in the affirmative. Commissioner Gutierrez continued by expressing her reservations about this approach, adding that she thinks that it is not a true systemic change but only a step towards the final solution. Ms. Gutierrez expressed her support for this project. She added that it is important that this information reach those providers that are limited in English. Ms. Nahat clarified that the additional stipend that would bring the highest wage up to \$21K is only part of a model and it is not guaranteed that all counties will adopt this model.

Commissioner Fortune and Ms. Nahat briefly discussed the approach to ultimately increase salaries. Commissioner Fortune suggested subsidizing private sector caregivers and that a greater portion of the COLA could go toward salaries. Commissioner Melia amended the discussion with salaries and benefits. Commissioner Fortune continued, stating that there are substantial funds available in the child care account that have not yet been committed and that could significantly impact this issue. Commissioner Fortune added that if the benefits issue was linked to healthy families, it would not be an additional expense to programs, which meets the Governor's goal of increasing enrollment.

Ms. Nahat responded to the first issue by pointing out that the CARES model statewide would cost \$154 million, and was not prepared to respond to the second point raised by Commissioner Fortune.

Commissioner Lacey raised the point of responsible employers that are using their own money and how those employers need to be considered.

Public Comment

Bruce Conklin, Chairman of the Nevada County Children and Families First Commission, offered the support of his commission and noted that they have set aside some funds. He expressed his desire to keep the types of funds available for matching as loosely defined as possible. Mr. Conklin added that the language be clear and to specifically mention this program. He noted that the benefit should also be available in many forms so as to include as many people as possible.

Rory Dera, Alameda County Children and Family Commission Staff, informed the Commission that the Alameda County Commission just initiated a child development core and 2,385 qualified child care providers including family child care, child care centers and 2 license exempt providers received a total of \$4,613,000 in stipends ranging from \$475.00 to \$5,100 with an extra stipend of \$300.00 for second language and \$325 for a Master's Degree.

Betty Smith, Commissioner, Mendocino County Children and Family Commission and Mendocino Child Care Planning Council, raised the question of definition of family care providers in order to determine who would be included and who would not.

Brenda Blasingame, Contra Costa County, expressed thanks for the Commission's work on this issue. Contra Costa County's plan is inclusive of family child care providers and have put \$3M towards this plan. Ms. Blasingame encouraged the Commission to use the language *pilot project* and continue to emphasize the evaluation component. Ms. Blasingame also encouraged the Commission to do investigation and call it a feasibility study that would run concurrent to the three-year pilot project, which begins to look at the systemic issues and the policy issues. The Contra Costa Commission had some concerns that exempt care providers may not receive this benefit. Ms. Blasingame closed by recognizing that the Commission's work is complementing the work being done at the local level.

Gloria Bringleston, Executive Director, San Diego County Children and Families Commission expressed concerns about the short timeframe for responding to the matching funds request for application.

Commissioner Melia commented that perhaps a survey of salaries should be done of those that are leaving child care, as a part of the baseline evaluation that the Commission plans to do in order to get an idea of the competition as it relates to retention.

Lisa Lee, Solano County Children and Family Commission, encouraged the Commission not to administer the retention of these programs directly, but rather to provide flexibility. Ms. Lee added that she is pleased that there is going to be a second allocation process so that funds would remain for those that are not as fast to act as others.

Arlyce Currie with Alameda County Local Planning Council and BANANAS, a resource and referral agency in Oakland, commented that the effects of the CARES program have been immediate. Seven hundred people recently attended a training seminar; two more are scheduled. All community college courses are beyond full and the Council is trying to get more classes available. Ms. Currie echoed the sentiments of Commissioner Fortune that this is not a long-term strategy towards compensation. Ms. Currie

emphasized the need for program evaluators' involvement.

Dee Cuney, Chair of the Private Child Care Network, reported that Napa County is awaiting funding of its CARES program. Ms. Cuney thanked the Commission for putting family day care first.

Mark Friedman, Alameda County Children and Families Commission, addressed the letter of intent deadline. Mr. Friedman endorsed the putting forward of the letter of intent by staff. Mr. Friedman added that this is an important program because it shows respect for the profession of child care.

Mary Welch, a private child care provider from Napa Valley, expressed her desires that private child care providers are included in this funding because they can not compete with public programs.

Chair Reiner read into the record a statement from Margaret Jurine, Chair of the Compensation Committee for the San Francisco Child Care Planning and Advisory Council, in which Ms. Jurine made a statement in favor of the Commission going forward.

MOTION: Chair Reiner moved, seconded by Commissioner Belshe to approve the release of an RFP based on the concept paper for provider compensation matching funds.

VOTE: The motion to approve the release of an RFP based on the concept paper for provider compensation matching funds carried by a roll call vote of 5-0-0 with Commissioners Gutierrez, Lacey, Reiner, Vismara and Belshe voting "YES", and no "NO" votes and no abstentions.

IX. Parent Education - Research Phase

Emily Nahat presented this action item. This project will support county commissions and providers of parent education. Staff is asking for an RFP based on this concept paper. The funding amount for this item is up to \$4M total over a four-year period. There have been several sources of input in the development of this project. Staff believes that this project will help providers of parent education get some high quality parenting information to those that they serve. The overall goal of this project is to create a resource system for county commissions and providers of parent education to promote the healthy development and school readiness of young children. There are 3 major components. The first component is identification of existing standards in the parent education field and development of standards for the commission to use that are in alignment with school readiness concepts. The second component would be to develop a database of evaluated materials, programs, effective strategies, resource centers available, networks of support and key research articles in the parent education. This would be for use of early childhood educators, license exempt child care providers, administrators, other professionals and other care givers. It would be organized around school readiness content standards. The database would be searchable by topic, child's age, language of the materials or the medium. The contractor will also provide training in the use of the database. The third component would be the development of an infrastructure plan to both sustain the database and continually assess new material and also to determine if adequate resources are available to support the parent education work being done in the community. It is anticipated that these 3 components would be accomplished in the first 2 years of the project and that the 3rd and 4th years would be to sustain the database.

Chair Reiner thanked staff for their efforts on this matter and offered his support for this type of venture. Mr. Reiner commented that this area is very weak. He referenced a magazine article relating to this issue.

Commissioner Vismara asked staff if they have identified or intend to identify entities that will provide partnership, collaboration and technical assistance to this project. Ms. Nahat responded in the affirmative. There will be people assessing and cataloging materials. This will take place after the request for proposals.

Commissioner Vismara suggested staff consider beginning the collaborations now, specifically the development of a small task force that might assist in evaluating proposals.

Commissioner Gutierrez asked staff to consider the effects of domestic violence.

Dr. Jane Henderson clarified that the funding request is in order to begin this process because it is not an in house project.

Public Comment

Gene Lucas suggested looking at formal parent education and its efficacy. Mr. Lucas suggested that parenting be taught in high school as a cost effective method.

Katheryn Foster, Commissioner, Sonoma County Children and Families Commission, raised the issue of leveraging. Ms. Foster expressed her belief that the State Commission can be a tremendous resource in helping the county commissions develop strategies for leveraging. She added that private money could be leveraged into this program and that the State Commission should help county commissions to identify partners. Chair Reiner replied that he was personally working on similar kinds of issues.

Gwen Stevens, Department of Education, Child Development Division, reminded the Commission of a resource in the Desired Results Standards in the developmental profiles that the Department of Education has been working on.

Sal Castillo pointed out that the Commission can not teach people if they can not reach them and raised questions about the educating process.

MOTION: Commissioner Gutierrez moved, seconded by Commissioner Vismara to approve the development of an RFP based on the concept paper presented here for the amount of up to \$4 million over a four year period.

VOTE: The motion carried by a roll call vote of 5-0-0 with Commissioners Gutierrez, Lacey, Reiner, Vismara and Belshe voting "YES", and no "NO" votes and no abstentions.

X. Media and Community Outreach Request for Proposals

Kristina Parham, Consultant, Director of Communications, presented a report on the release of an RFP for media and community outreach (Public Relations) in the amount of up to \$10 million a year. An RFP had been released for the advertising portion of the Communications Department. CCFC is currently under contract with an agency and several subcontractors that deal with public relations in the areas of media outreach and community outreach for both the general market and for ethnic audiences. This contract will expire in early 2001 and a new RFP is required to procure the next agency. The following "scope of work items" were developed internally with staff as well as with input from the county commissions: 1) media and community outreach, including general and ethnic market activities, 2) material distribution center, to facilitate distribution of developed material to the county commissions, and 3) community based organizations. Media and community outreach would include the following activities: improving press relations, offering media technical assistance to the county commissions, developing and producing collateral materials, implementing community outreach activities, developing partnerships with companies and community groups. Other activities would include coordinating with the Commission's advertising campaign to facilitate an integrated approach, conducting training and the production of newsletters. The second large scope item is the material distribution center, which is self-explanatory. The third large scope item is staff and logistical support from the public relations team that will be hired. The eligibility

requirements for the public relations RFP are: 1) a full service California based office, 2) at least \$5 million in annual billings and 3) strict conflict of interest provisions. With respect to tobacco, the state's lead tobacco agencies lead will be followed in terms of whom they do business with. Similar standards will be applied to companies that have alcohol on their advertisement roster. There is also an evaluation component. An outside person will be assigned the task of evaluating efficacy.

The program is currently budgeted about \$3 million per year for fees and expenses through the public relations contract. Looking to increase the budgeting for fees and expenses up to \$4 million per year to help assist county commissions. Communications is looking for \$4 million per year for community based organization programs, which is a 10th of the total communications outlay. The third budget item is up to \$2 million per year for material distribution clearinghouse. The RFP will be structured in a similar manner to the ad RFP. The review panel will be comprised of people from the State Commission, county commissions, anti-tobacco organizations, children and family advocacy groups and California foundations. This panel will be used to choose the contractor.

Staff feels the need for a CBO component to be effective and make the communications outreach a three-tiered approach. The first is a paid media campaign that will include a county specific approach. The next level is the media and community outreach work, which is really the public relations part of the communications outreach program. The third level is CBO outreach, which provides a conduit to communities that do not get traditional media. The purpose of the CBO is to build on the momentum of the public relations effort and to raise awareness of early childhood development. It would also be used to promote the state and county commission funded programs.

There are several CBO in California that the Communications is looking to work with. The first would be people who provide direct services to families, e.g., family resource center, and health clinic or child care center. The second would be those that reach families that reach families but don't necessarily provide the services that Prop. 10 is used to working with, perhaps a faith based organization or refugee organization. The third would be CBOs that work with professionals that work with families. Staff feels that there are a number of demographics that would not be reached without this type of approach. Staff also feels that this approach will meet public expectations.

In the last month staff met with the Executive Directors Association to discuss this concept and to find out if they would be interested in it, given the need for partnership. Staff expressed desires for input with respect to implementation.

Some funding methods include providing block grants to the county commissions so that they may do their own RFP programs. Benefits to this structure include coordination of local programs and the closer relationships of county commissions to their local partners. The second structure did not receive as much support. It is a state administered and funded CBO process. The third option is a regionally administered CBO process. This would be a partnership between state and county commissions. Sacramento and Bay area county commissions have expressed needs that will cross county lines. This need could be addressed by this regional approach. The counties and the state should work through the division of regions. This approach results in less duplication of effort at the county commission level. The decision-making would remain at the local level and it would also assure the consistency of message delivered across county lines.

A discussion regarding CBOs and their role in communications followed. Staff recognized that this was a very complicated issue.

A discussion regarding outreach efficacy followed. Staff outlined some basic measures and recognized that this depends on what is funded. Staff requested returning to this issue at a later date.

Staff pointed out that local commissions would craft some local messages delivered to the community and that some of the more broad messages would be crafted, in part, by the State Commission.

A discussion on the appearance of a CBO campaign followed. An example of a specific campaign may be a CBO that reaches a Hmong community funded by the State Commission to do outreach within their community. It could also be more county-focused, e.g., where people may get their children immunized in the county etc.

A discussion followed on the definition of types of communications work that would be done. One part of the CBO plan would be reaching people and informing them of programs and services, and another is communicating the importance of early childhood development. It was clarified that the regional efforts would be more of a coordination effort of the individual county efforts. The decision on funding particular county CBOs could be made by the State Commission, but requires further discussion. The term *region* does not necessarily equate to media market.

A discussion followed on the availability of increasing degrees of sophisticated telecommunications. It was suggested that some of this technology be adapted for use in child development.

A discussion followed on the restrictions involving faith based organizations. The legal questions raised with respect to the issue remain to be addressed.

Public Comment

Dorinda Ohnstad, Executive Director, Kings County Children and Families Commission, expressed her satisfaction with her experience working with the State Commission.

Hugo Morales, Radio Bilingue, made comments on the CBO grant program with respect to marginalized populations. Mr. Morales thanked the staff for all of their efforts and informed the Commission of the KPPF radio station and how this station interacts with the community. This station is run and owned by local farm workers. This radio station's efforts are not unique. Mr. Morales listed some of the criteria that he felt should be incorporated in this initiative: 1) focus on the ability of the community based media outlets that have a relationship with, and the trust of, the targeted populations being reached, examination of the Rockefeller Foundation's paper on communication for social change, 2) the community organization have, (a) has significant representation from the community they propose to serve, (b) a community-based entity with non profit 501c3 status, (c) works in collaboration with its audience to determine their needs, and (d) works in collaboration with other community based organizations, 3) media outlets selected must work with other relevant entities in a collaborative and collective approach, 4) that the Commission work with grass roots ethnic media wherever it exists, and 5) that the Commission see the initiative for community outreach in media list the CBO of program in the context of what it is and what is not. Mr. Morales emphasized the need for clearly defined program objectives.

Joseph Herasco from the Hoopa Tribe, Station Manager of KIDE, an Indian owned radio station, offered his support for community based organizations. He pointed out that the fact that his radio station was the only Indian owned radio station was indicative of the need for more of this type of media outlet. Mr. Herasco expressed concerns that a regional approach would limit local efforts. He will be meeting with other tribes to assess who has what technology.

Commissioner Vismara raised the point that the technical divide has not been directly addressed.

Mark Friedman from Alameda County spoke in support of the proposal. He addressed some media and marketing details which included, 1) having a regional parenting radio show, 2) having a regular column in a local newspaper, 3) getting a weekly parenting segment on one of the television news stations and 4) coordinating a master calendar of regional media events.

Jenny Tashif from Sonoma County encouraged the Commission to tailor the plan so that the counties get the block grant. Ms. Tashif expressed her fear that a mid level regional body may complicate matters further.

John Siegel from Trinity County spoke on the lack of a communication system in his county. Mr. Siegel identified his county's needs as being unique.

Laurie Wyatt from Sierra County Children and Family Commission spoke on local level evaluations. Sierra County's needs assessment survey showed that 35 to 40% of those surveyed had knowledge of the services available and even less availed themselves of those services. Suggested regional PR people to assist local commissions.

Linda Siegel from Prevent Child Abuse California encouraged the Commission to fund the CBOs in such a way as to not detract from the heart of their program. This could be effected by involving the CBOs in the funding process.

It was suggested looking at a different fund matching formula so as not to burden some of the counties.

Gene Lucas expressed his support for the educational materials clearinghouse and asked that it be expanded to include selected materials developed by others.

Chair Reiner directed staff to put together a task force consisting of two Commissioners to work with staff to move this project forward in the November meeting.

XI. Review of State Commission Guidelines.

The Commission discussed the review of the existing state guidelines and possible future activities associated with amending the current guidelines. Dr. Jane Henderson made two recommendations: 1) allow those county commissions that have not yet completed their strategic plans, more time to do so and, 2) before considering what should be done, staff should have the opportunity to develop, in full, the technical assistance plan and to hear from the county commissions about the value and necessity of engaging in a wholesale revision of the guidelines. Dr. Henderson noted that there were items on the agenda today that would affect how changes in the guidelines should be pursued.

Commissioner Gutierrez suggested that the Commission look to the Advisory Committee on Diversity and see how to strengthen the areas involving children with disabilities and people with limited-English proficiency.

Public Comments

Dee Cuney, Chair of the Private Child Care Network, asked the Commission if the guidelines include information for the commissions and for the general public on RFPs. Dr. Henderson replied that a separate document has been produced by the Technical Assistance Center to address this issue. Ms. Cuney suggested a mechanism for making equitable the participation in the RFP process for all types of child care programs. She suggested a tear-off sheet for every one of the programs that requested any funding that would go to the County Council's Office and a number assigned to the RFP. The sheet would allow for reviewing completeness and for the elimination of conflict of interest for those reading or Commissioners

sitting on the Commission.

Commissioner Vismara asked Dr. Henderson if the booklet to assist with RFP is displayed on the Commission website. Mr. Munso replied that it is on CCHI's website and linked to the Commission's website. Commissioner Vismara suggested bringing all of this information to the Commission's website and to consider that the site be interactive. Ms. Henderson noted that the RFP guidebook is thick and copies are readily available.

Commissioner Melia expressed his concerns regarding implications that there is anything at the state or county level that chills participation of private child care providers and clarified that he does not believe that it is the Commission's intention. Commissioner Lacey responded that it certainly is not the Commission's intention and that, in fact, at the last meeting in Ventura County, 50% of the awards were for private child care providers.

XII. Contract for Strategic Plan Regional Training and Reviews

Jane Henderson addressed the fact that this item is a continuation of funding for a technical assistance service as well as a tool for designing strategic plans; the tool has been used by several counties. This proposal would allow the State Commission to contract directly with UCLA for the continued use of the strategic planning tool. Four regional training sessions would be held throughout the state, which would be informal presentations of the tool. The training sessions would also allow for participating county commissions to share their experiences in developing their strategic plan, participate in developing solutions to challenges, explore how the tool best suits their needs, and to develop an action plan for completing or revising their strategic plan. Additionally, there is funding available, including funding for travel, allowing for full participation of all county commissions, as well as the option for one on one consultation with counties. The budget of \$146,192.00 is proposed for a short time to gauge usage and to determine if the tool is something that should be expanded and continued in one form or another.

MOTION: Chair Reiner moved, seconded by Commissioner Lacey, that the Commission approves the development of a contract with UCLA's Center for Healthier Children, Families and Communities for \$146,192.00.

VOTE: The motion carried by a roll call vote of 5-0-0 with Commissioners Gutierrez, Lacey, Reiner, Vismara and Belshe voting "YES", and no "NO" votes and no abstentions.

XIII. Statewide Conference for County Commissions

Emily Nahat stated that the Statewide Conference Planning Group will request \$375,000 in funding for the planning, development and presentation of statewide conferences to be held for County Commissions in 2001 and 2002. The funds are for facility, audio visual, meeting materials, speaker honoraria and conference planner services. The budget assumes that a registration fee be collected.

MOTION: Chair Reiner moved, seconded by Commissioner Belshe, that the Commission approve the \$375,000.00 for funding conferences.

VOTE: The motion carried by a roll call vote of 5-0-0 with Commissioners Gutierrez, Lacey, Reiner, Vismara and Belshe voting "YES", and no "NO" votes and no abstentions.

XIV. Proposal for the Provision of Program Support Funding for Local Children and Families Commissions.

Jean Soliz, Nevada County, Chair of the Rural Caucus of the Executive Directors Association, on behalf of the Association of California County Children and Families Executives, presented this proposal. This is the first formal proposal from this organization and is being presented on behalf of 31 small counties. The association believes that the success of the smaller counties is integral to success as a whole. Ms. Soliz presented a list of statute requirements. Small counties are sacrificing in order to implement Prop. 10. The service sacrifice approach is being used in many counties in which they are paying out 13-14% in administrative dollars to fulfill the obligations. The human sacrifice approach is one in which people are not being compensated adequately. The third model is one in which the counties are hiring a part time clerk to disperse funds which does not implement Prop. 10. The Association's formula assumes that any county would need \$125,000 to do these processes. The proposal provides that the county support 5% of this burden and that the State matches the rest. The proposal requires that these funds be spent on administration but that it is voluntary. Ms. Soliz believes that the funds can come from the State's unallocated funds.

Chair Reiner asked Ms. Soliz where the problem lies in determining the amount of money for these other commissions to become viable and giving it as a loose block grant, i.e., why are the restrictions required. Ms. Soliz replied that the local commissions are then able to buy the administration they need without taking a lot of heat. A discussion on the merits of funds usage requirements followed. The question of legal authority was raised and it was suggested that these spending mandates would be problematic. Ms. Soliz emphasized to the Commission that the association would rather have the money without strings than not have it at all. The question of how this might affect regional administration was raised.

Commissioner Gutierrez stated that if the Commission's legal counsel identifies this approach as problematic, then that is enough reason for her not to go forward with this mandated spending approach.

Commissioner Vismara voiced support for regional administrative support.

Chair Reiner urged the discovery of another mode of fund assignment.

It was suggested that this be an interim approach to the funding problem.

Chair Reiner asked how long this \$2.5 million would be needed. Ms. Soliz replied with 2 years. Chair Reiner then suggested waiting for two years while another solution is researched. Staff suggested that the local commissions decide how to use the funds.

Public Comment

Bruce Conklin, Chairman, Board of Supervisors in Nevada County, spoke to concerns about political heat regarding spending. It is the Commissioners that will face the political heat. The small counties are always asking for more money and these counties are very fiscally conservative. Mr. Conklin supported this issue without strings. Commissioner Fortune suggested putting the \$2.5 million out as a planning grant. Discussion followed on this point and an informal consensus was reached in the affirmative. It was suggested that this be handled on a county-by-county basis.

Robert Erickson, Chairman of the Lake County Children and Families Commission, suggested that the Commission gives the money with the intention that each county be viable administratively, but that each county would not be held to spending the funds toward this end. Mr. Erickson does not believe that regional administration is a good idea due to geographic reasons.

Further discussion on mandating fund use followed. It was decided that the grant would be called an implementation grant.

MOTION: Chair Reiner moved, seconded by Commissioner Lacey, that the Commission approve the allocation of \$2.5 million for two years for small counties in the form of an implementation grant.

VOTE: The motion carried by a roll call vote of 5-0-0 with Commissioners Gutierrez, Lacey, Reiner, Vismara and Belshe voting "YES", and no "NO" votes and no abstentions.

XV. Advisory Committee Vacancies

The Advisory Committee on Diversity currently has two vacancies. The Co-Chairs of the Committee will discuss a process for filling the current, as well as future vacancies. In two weeks staff would like to receive nominations from Commissioners on individuals with special needs background for these positions. The individuals will have experience with children from 0-5 years.

XVI. Closed Session. (A closed session was held regarding the status report from Legal Counsel regarding pending litigation)

- 1) **California Association of Retail Tobacconists, Inc. et al., v. State of California, Board of Equalization of the State of California, California Children and Families First Commission and Kathleen Connell, as Controller of the State of California, San Diego Superior Court Case No. 732079; Government par. 11126(e)(1) and 11125(e)(2)(A)**
- 2) **Cigarettes Cheaper! And the Customer Company v. Board of Equalization of the State of California, Kathleen Connell, as Controller of the State of California, and the California Children and Families First Commission, San Diego County Superior Court Case No. GIC743506; Government Code par 11126(3)(1) and 11126(2)(A)**

XVII. County Commission Reports: Napa, Sonoma, Solano, Lake.

Jackie Dollar provided copies of her presentation to the Commission and she thanked the Commission for letting Napa host this meeting. Ms. Dollar also expressed thanks to Sally Shehan-Brown and Mony Flores-Bower for their efforts in helping to host this meeting.

Barbara Graves from the Sonoma County Health Department commented that the goal of the home visiting program is to reach the first born, and new born of every parent in the county and estimated that number to be around 2500 newborns on an annual basis. This would include 1 to 3 home visits per child.

Paul Crissy from Solano County Children and Family Commission reported that his commission adopted a spending grid in which some funds would go towards direct services and some would go to planning grants. Mr. Crissy noted that 5 of the 9 commission members are non-Anglo. Mr. Crissy has had many constituents approach him stating that they would like to be trained in child care thereby assisting their community.

Robert Erickson, Chairman of the Lake County Children and Families Commission reported that Lake County's strategic plan was submitted and approved in August. Plans are underway to expand the County Commission from 5 to 9 members, both to diversify representation and to allay conflict of interest concerns. Susan Berry and Randall Thomas were introduced as Lake County's new Executive Directors.

XVIII. County Commissioner Executive Directors' Report.

Dorinda Ohnstad, Director of the Association of California County Children and Families Executives, reported that she had met with Jane Henderson and Karen Bodenhorn to work out a system for delivering technical assistance. Two categories of technical assistance were clearly delineated from these meetings. The first being localized in nature and the second having statewide policy implications. The association is ready to deal with some localized issues, e.g., organizational development, local capacity building, strategic planning, collaborative and community partnerships, fiscal and resource management, and things that are very distinctive from county to county. The association has been working with CCHI and has sent a proposal to the Packard Foundation. The association is also looking at working with the California Endowment to continue funding some of the local services provided at the TA center. The association has established a Technical Assistance Committee that will work together with Ms. Henderson and staff to oversee technical assistance and to make sure that technical assistance needs are met. The association will have a retreat with CCHI to address these issues and then present them to staff. Ultimately, the goal is to have an MOU in place both with CCHI and with the state so that it is clear as to who is delivering what services and how those are integrated. The technical advisory board would oversee both of those.

Commissioner Belshe inquired if CCHI would continue to play a role in technical assistance, but more in direct partnership with counties dealing with localized TA needs. Ms. Ohnstad responded in the affirmative. The association is looking into getting outside philanthropic support that would go to the association. Another part of the funding is the association's organizational structure. The funding also includes provisions for the rural travel assistance to the smaller counties so that may continue their participation.

Ms. Ohnstad reported that Commissioner Gutierrez met with the association recently and talked about diversity. Ms. Ohnstad extended an invitation to each of the State Commissioners to attend a meeting.

The Association encouraged the Commission to adopt a process whereby the association would have an opportunity to review action items on the agenda and present a written recommendation.

Ms. Ohnstad reported that the opportunity to participate in shaping community based media was a positive experience. She thanked the Commission for funding the implementation grants to the smaller counties.

Commissioner Vismara inquired how many of the TA Committee members have expertise or background in disabilities. Ms. Ohnstad replied that she would have to get back to him on that matter.

Commissioner Melia inquired how the Executive Directors' Association would provide written input to each of the agenda items. Commissioner Belshe suggested that a discussion item followed by an action item should resolve this issue.

XIX. Executive Director's Report.

Jane Henderson reported that any critical items will be posted on the website.

XX. Communications Director's Report.

Critical items will be posted on the website.

XXI. Legislative Update.

Critical items will be posted on the website.

XXII. Adjournment.

They're being no further business, upon motion by Chairman Reiner, seconded by Commissioner Lacey, the meeting adjourned at 5pm. The motion carried unanimously.